

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 12447-US-PA
Application No.: 10/708,489

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding nonfinal Office Action mailed Dec. 29, 2005. Applicants submit that a typing informality of claim 1 has been corrected hereby, and claims 7 and 8 have been canceled hereby. There is no new matter entered and thus no new ground can be necessitated. As such, applicants submit that the next Office Action should not be made Final in accordance with the minor amendment of claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims 1-6 are respectfully requested.

Claim Objection

Claims 7 and 8 are objected. In response to the objection, Applicants canceled claims 7 and 8, and thus the objection is moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ooishi US 5,689,460.

In response to the rejection to claims 1 and 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ooishi US 5,689,460, Applicants canceled claims 7 and 8 and hereby otherwise

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 12447-US-PA
Application No.: 10/708,489

traverse this rejection. As such, Applicant submits that claims 1, 5 and 6 are now in condition for allowance.

With respect to claim 1, as currently amended, recites in part:

A voltage regulator apparatus, comprising:

... a first transistor having a first terminal coupled to a positive terminal of a voltage source, a second terminal coupled to a first bias, and **a third terminal coupled to the output terminal of the voltage regulator** ... (emphasis added)

Applicants submit that such a voltage regulator apparatus as set forth in claim 1 is neither taught, disclosed, nor suggested by Ooishi '460 or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination.

Ooishi '460 fails to disclose, teach or suggest "a first transistor having a first terminal coupled to a positive terminal of a voltage source, a second terminal coupled to a first bias, and a **third terminal coupled to the output terminal of the voltage regulator**" as set forth in claim 1 (Emphasis added). As shown in FIG. 11, Ooishi '460 teaches that item 5 that is alleged to read on the output terminal, and item N3 that is alleged to read on the first transistor is not coupled to each other, as required for the voltage regulator apparatus, as set forth in claim 1. More specially,

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 12447-US-PA
Application No.: 10/708,489

the transistor N3 has a third terminal (source) coupled to the node 6 and the node 6 is coupled to the gate of the transistor 2 having a drain terminal coupled to the item 5. Therefore, Ooishi '460 fails to teach, disclose or suggest each and every element as set forth in claim 1, either expressly or inherently. (MPEP §2131) Thus, claim 1 is submitted to be new and unobvious over Ooishi '460, and should be allowable.

If independent claim 1 is allowable over the prior art of record, then its dependent claims 5 and 6 are allowable as a matter of law, because these dependent claims contain all features of their respective independent claim 1. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooishi US 5,689,460 in view of the acknowledged prior art.

In response to the rejection to claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ooishi US 5,689,460, Applicants submit that claims 2-4 depend from claim 1, and if independent claim 1 is allowable over the prior art of record, then its dependent claims 2-4 are allowable as a matter of law, because these dependent claims contain all features of their respective independent claim 1. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 12447-US-PA
Application No.: 10/708,489

Further, Ooishi US 5,689,460 does not disclose a load circuit providing a feedback voltage to the positive terminal of the error amplifier, as recited in Claim 2. The load circuit 7 of Ooishi US 5,689,460 does not provide a feedback voltage feedback to the comparator.

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 12447-US-PA
Application No.: 10/708,489

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 1-6 are in proper condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date: *March 29, 2006*

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee
Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jicpgroup.com.tw
Usa@jicpgroup.com.tw